POSET ENTROPY VERSUS NUMBER OF LINEAR EXTENSIONS: THE WIDTH-2 CASE

SAMUEL FIORINI AND SELIM REXHEP

arXiv:1402.5024v1 [math.CO] 20 Feb 2014

Abstract. Kahn and Kim (J. Comput. Sci., 1995) have shown that for a finite poset P, the entropy of the incomparability graph of P (normalized by multiplying by the order of P) and the base-2 logarithm of the number of linear extensions of P are within constant factors from each other. The tight constant for the upper bound was recently shown to be 2 by Cardinal, Fiorini, Joret, Jungers and Munro (STOC 2010, Combinatorica). Here, we refine this last result in case P has width 2: we show that the constant can be replaced by $2 - \varepsilon$ if one also takes into account the number of connected components of size 2 in the incomparability graph of P. Our result leads to a better upper bound for the number of comparisons in algorithms for the problem of sorting under partial information.

1. Introduction

The entropy of a graph is an information theoretic concept introduced by Körner in 1973 [8]. Since then, links with many interesting combinatorial objects have been found, see the survey paper of Simonyi [10] for more information.

In this paper, we consider the case in which the graph is the incomparability graph $\overline{G}(P)$ of a (finite) poset P. We denote $H(\overline{P}) := H(\overline{G}(P))$ the entropy of this graph. Kahn and Kim [7] have proved that $|P| \cdot H(\overline{P})$ is within a constant of $\log e(P)$, the base-2 logarithm of the number of linear extensions of P. Throughout this paper, log denotes the base-2 logarithm.

Theorem 1 (Kahn and Kim [7])**.** *For every poset P:*

$$\log e(P) \leqslant |P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) \leqslant c_0 \log e(P)$$

for $c_0 = (1 + 7 \log \mathrm{e}) \simeq 11.1$.

Cardinal, Fiorini, Joret, Jungers and Munro [2] improved the constant in the upper bound to 2. This is tight since if P is a two-elements antichain we have $|P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) = 2$ and $\log e(P) = 1$.

Theorem 2 (Cardinal et al. [2])**.** *For every poset P:*

$$|P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) \leqslant 2 \log e(P).$$

Our starting point is the observation that the upper bound is tight if every element of P is incomparable to at most one other element, that is, P is the ordinal sum of one-element and two-elements antichains: $P = A_1 \oplus A_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_k$ where each $|A_i| \leqslant 2$. Thus it seems likely that for some small enough constant $\varepsilon > 0$, one can prove that the posets with $|P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) \geqslant (2 - \varepsilon) \log e(P)$ possess a very constrained structure. Our main result is to establish such a phenomenon for width-2 posets and thus refine Theorem 2 in this case. We recall that the *width* of poset P is the size of a largest antichain of P.

Theorem 3. *Let P be a width-2 poset and let $\kappa_2(P)$ denote the number of size-2 connected components of $\overline{G}(P)$. Then*

$$|P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) \leqslant (2 - \varepsilon) \log e(P) + \varepsilon \, \kappa_2(P) \tag{1}$$

for $\varepsilon = 2 - \frac{3 \log 3 - 2}{\log 3} \simeq 0.26$.

We remark that upper bounds such as those in Theorems 1 and 2 translate to upper bounds on the worst case number of comparisons performed by algorithms for a sorting problem known as *sorting under partial information*, see e.g. [2] for more details. In the context of this problem,

Theorem 3 yields an improvement in the width-2 case (*merging under partial information*) because after comparing each of the $\kappa_2(P)$ pairs of elements that form connected components of $\overline{G}(P)$, the constant in front of $\log e(P)$ decreases from 2 to $2 - \varepsilon \simeq 1.74$. Furthermore, we point out that the algorithm given by Cardinal et al. [2] reduces the general problem to the width-2 case, hence Theorem 3 also gives an improvement in the general case.

We begin in Section 2 with a brief account of the definitions and main properties of graph entropy. In Section 3, we specialize this to (in)comparability graphs of posets and further to (in)comparability graphs of width-2 posets. Then, in Section 4, we prove that we can restrict to posets P such that: (i) $\overline{G}(P)$ is connected; (ii) P is a width-2 interval order. Notice that this in particular implies that $\overline{G}(P)$ is a tree. Finally, in Section 5, we prove that we can almost always find a 'good' edge in $\overline{G}(P)$ whose removal does not decrease much $|P| \cdot H(\overline{P})$ and at the same time decreases $\log e(P)$ sufficiently. This allows us to implement a proof by induction on $|P|$ because the removal of any edge from $\overline{G}(P)$ produces a poset P' that decomposes as an ordinal sum of two smaller posets. The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Section 6, except for a small number of particular cases in which we cannot find a 'good' edge. We treat these special cases in Section 7.

2. Graph Entropy

Here we recall the definition and main properties of the entropy $H(G)$ of a (finite, simple and undirected) graph $G = (V, E)$, as well as the algorithm of Körner and Marton to compute $H(G)$ in case G is bipartite. For a more detailed discussion of graph entropy, including the origins of the concept, see the paper of Simonyi [10]. Here, we only state the facts that are used in this work.

The definition of $H(G)$ we use relies on the *stable set polytope*

$$\mathrm{STAB}(G) := \mathrm{conv}\left(\{\chi^S \in \mathbb{R}^V \mid S \subseteq V,\ S \text{ stable set of } G\}\right)$$

with $\mathrm{conv}(\cdot)$ denoting the convex hull in $\mathbb{R}^V \cong \mathbb{R}^{|V|}$ and $\chi^S \in \{0,1\}^V$ the characteristic vector of S, defined by $\chi^S_v = 1$ if and only if $v \in S$.

Letting $n := |V|$, the *entropy* of G is defined as

$$H(G) := \min_{x \in \mathrm{STAB}(G),\, x>0} -\sum_{v \in V} \frac{1}{n} \log x_v = \min_{x \in \mathrm{STAB}(G),\, x>0} \sum_{v \in V} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{x_v}. \tag{2}$$

Note that the function $f(x) := -\sum_{v \in V} \frac{1}{n} \log x_v$ is continuous over $\mathbb{R}^V_{>0}$ and that the point $\frac{1}{n}\chi^V$ is always in $\mathrm{STAB}(G)$, with $f(\frac{1}{n}\chi^V) = \log n$. Thus the minimum in (2) can be computed over the set $\mathrm{STAB}(G) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^V_{>0} \mid f(x) \leqslant \log n\}$, which is compact. This proves that $H(G)$ is well-defined. Moreover, we have $0 \leqslant H(G) \leqslant \log n$. Finally, since $f(x)$ is strictly convex, its minimizer over $\mathrm{STAB}(G) \cap \mathbb{R}^V_{>0}$ is unique.

We start with a basic result that enables us to compute the entropy of disconnected graphs. The proof follows directly from the fact that $\mathrm{STAB}(G_1 \cup G_2) = \mathrm{STAB}(G_1) \times \mathrm{STAB}(G_2)$ in case G_1 and G_2 have disjoint vertex sets.

Proposition 4. *Let $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ be two graphs with disjoint vertex sets and $G = G_1 \cup G_2 = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2)$ their disjoint union. Then*

$$|G| \cdot H(G) = |G_1| \cdot H(G_1) + |G_2| \cdot H(G_2).$$

For general graphs G, no complete linear description of $\mathrm{STAB}(G)$ is known. (In fact, the existence of a tractable description for all graphs G would imply NP = co-NP.) However, a complete description of $\mathrm{STAB}(G)$ is known in case G is a perfect graph, see Theorem 5 below.

Recall that a graph G is perfect if $\chi(H) = \omega(H)$ for every induced subgraph H of G, where $\omega(H)$ is the size of the largest clique of H and $\chi(H)$ is the chromatic number of H. The reader can find more basic information on perfect graphs, e.g., in Diestel [6]. Later we will use the well-known fact that a graph G is perfect if and only if its complement $\overline{G}$ is perfect.

Theorem 5 (Chvátal [5]). *A graph $G = (V, E)$ is perfect if and only if*

$$\mathrm{STAB}(G) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^V_{\geqslant 0} \mid \sum_{v \in K} x_v \leqslant 1 \ \text{ for all cliques } K \text{ of } G\}.$$

Assume that G is perfect and consider the optimal solution x^* to (2). Let y^* be the point with $y^*_v := \frac{1}{nx^*_v}$ for $v \in V$. By optimality of x^*, the inequality $\sum_{v \in V} y^*_v x_v \leqslant 1$ is valid for $\mathrm{STAB}(G)$. Then Theorem 5 (together with Farkas's lemma) implies that y^* is a convex combination of characteristic vectors of cliques of G. Thus $y^* \in \mathrm{STAB}(\overline{G})$. Now, since $x^* \in \mathrm{STAB}(G)$, the inequality $\sum_{v \in V} x^*_v y_v \leqslant 1$ is valid for $\mathrm{STAB}(\overline{G})$. Moreover, this inequality is tight at y^*, implying that y^* is a locally optimal solution of (2) for $\overline{G}$. By convexity, y^* is a globally optimal solution.

This argument implies in particular the following important result.

Theorem 6. *For every n-vertex perfect graph G,*

$$H(G) + H(\overline{G}) = \log n.$$

In fact, this result can be turned into a characterization of perfect graphs by considering arbitrary probability distributions supported on V, whereas the definitions used here assume a uniform distribution, see [8].

We will make intensive use of the following theorem of Körner and Marton on the entropy of bipartite graphs, and also of the algorithm on which the proof is based. We describe their algorithm after stating the result.

Theorem 7 (Körner and Marton [9]). *Let G be a n-vertex bipartite graph with bipartition $A \cup B$. Then one can find disjoint subsets $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ and $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ of A and B (respectively) with $A = A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_k$ and $B = B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_k$ such that*

$$H(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{|A_i| + |B_i|}{n} \, h\left(\frac{|A_i|}{|A_i| + |B_i|}\right) \tag{3}$$

with $h : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $h(x) := -x \log x - (1 - x) \log(1 - x)$ for $x \in (0, 1)$ and $h(0) = h(1) := 0$.

In their paper [9], Körner and Marton gave the following algorithm to find pairs A_i, B_i as in Theorem 7. For simplicity, we assume first that G has no isolated vertex. Let A_1 be a subset of A maximizing the ratio $|A_1|/|B_1|$ where $B_1 := N(A_1)$ is the set of neighbors of A_1. Furthermore, choose A_1 inclusion-wise minimal with this property. Now iterate this on the graph $G - A_1 - B_1$ with bipartition $(A - A_1) \cup (B - B_1)$ to have the pair A_2, B_2, and so on until $A - A_1 - \ldots - A_{i-1}$ is empty (in which case $B - B_1 - \ldots - B_{i-1}$ is empty too).

In case G has isolated vertices, then the first pairs A_i, B_i are of the form $\{a\}, \varnothing$ where $a \in A$ is isolated in G, with ratio $|A_i|/|B_i| = +\infty$. The algorithm stops whenever $A - A_1 - \ldots - A_{i-1}$ is empty. It may be that $B - B_1 - \ldots - B_{i-1}$ is not empty, but then it consists of vertices that are isolated in the initial graph G. These are collected in further pairs A_i, B_i of the form $\varnothing, \{b\}$.

We refer to the algorithm described in the two last paragraphs as the *KM algorithm* (for Körner and Marton).

Lemma 8. *Let G be a bipartite graph and A_i, B_i for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ denote the pairs constructed by the KM algorithm. Then $G[A_i \cup B_i]$ is connected for all i.*

Proof. If $G[A_i \cup B_i]$ is not connected, then A_i is the disjoint union of two subsets A^1_i and A^2_i with disjoint neighborhoods B^1_i and B^2_i respectively, in the graph $G - A_1 - B_1 - \ldots - A_{i-1} - B_{i-1}$. Then

$$\frac{|A_i|}{|B_i|} = \frac{|A^1_i| + |A^2_i|}{|B^1_i| + |B^2_i|} \leqslant \max\left\{\frac{|A^1_i|}{|B^1_i|}, \frac{|A^2_i|}{|B^2_i|}\right\},$$

contradicting the fact that A_i was chosen inclusion-wise minimal among the sets with $|A_i|/|B_i|$ maximum. □

Now, we sketch a proof of Theorem 7 based on the KM algorithm. First, consider the point $x^* \in \mathrm{STAB}(G)$ given by

$$x^*_u = \frac{|A_i|}{|A_i| + |B_i|} \quad \text{if } u \in A_i \quad \text{and} \quad x^*_v = \frac{|B_i|}{|A_i| + |B_i|} \quad \text{if } v \in B_i.$$

Then, represent each vertex of G by a rectangle of width x^*_v, height $y^*_v := \frac{1}{nx^*_v}$ and thus area $\frac{1}{n}$. Arrange the n rectangles into a (perfect) packing of the unit square, as illustrated on Figure 1. Since graph G has no edge from A_i to B_j and $|A_i|/|B_i| \geqslant |A_j|/|B_j|$ whenever $i < j$, we have $x^*_u + x^*_v \leqslant 1$ for all $uv \in E$ and hence $x^* \in \mathrm{STAB}(G)$. Proving that $y^* \in \mathrm{STAB}(\overline{G})$ requires a bit more work, but notice that we at least have $\sum_{v \in K} y^*_v \leqslant 1$ for all cliques K of $\overline{G}$ corresponding to rectangles meeting a common vertical. By Theorem 6, both x^* and y^* are optimal solutions to their respective minimization problems and thus (3) holds.



FIGURE 1. Illustration of the KM algorithm.

3. Poset Entropy

If $P = (X, \leqslant)$ is a finite poset, the entropy of P is defined to be the entropy of its comparability graph $G(P)$. We will write this $H(P)$. The entropy of the incomparability graph $\overline{G}(P)$ of P is written $H(\overline{P})$.

Now, we give an equivalent and more intuitive definition of $H(P)$ due to Cardinal et al. [4]. A collection $\{(y_{v^-}, y_{v^+})\}_{v \in X}$ of open intervals contained in $(0, 1)$ is called *consistent* with P if the associated interval order is an extension of $\leqslant$, that is, if $v < w$ in P implies $y_{v^+} \leqslant y_{w^-}$ or in other words the interval for v is entirely to the left of the interval for w. If $\mathcal{I}(P)$ denotes the set of all these collections of intervals then we have the following result.

Theorem 9 (Cardinal et al. [4])**.** *If $P = (X, \leqslant)$ is a poset of order n then*

$$H(P) = \min \left\{ -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in X} \log x_v \mid \exists \{(y_{v^-}, y_{v^+})\}_{v \in X} \in \mathcal{I}(P) \text{ with } x_v = y_{v^+} - y_{v^-} \forall v \in X \right\}. \tag{4}$$

It turns out that not only the lengths x_v of the intervals in an optimal solution to (4) are unique, but also the intervals themselves.

Lemma 10. *The collection of intervals $\{(y^*_{v^-}, y^*_{v^+})\}_{v \in X} \in \mathcal{I}(P)$ giving the minimum in (4) is unique.*

Proof. Let x_v^* denote the length of the interval for $v \in X$ in any optimal solution to (4). We know that $x^* \in \mathrm{STAB}(G(P))$ and is unique. We have to prove that the lengths x_v^* determine the intervals. To see this define $z^* \in \mathrm{STAB}(\overline{G}(P))$ by letting $z_v^* = \frac{1}{nx_v^*}$ as in the discussion after Theorem 5. Recall that the inequality $\sum_{v\in X} z_v^* x_v \leqslant 1$ is valid for $\mathrm{STAB}(G(P))$ and thus z^* is a convex combination of cliques of $G(P)$, that is, of chains of P. For each of these chains C, we have $\sum_{v\in C} x_v^* = 1$. In the collection of intervals $\{(y_{v^-}^*, y_{v^+}^*)\}_{v\in X}$, the chain C is thus formed of consecutive intervals spanning the whole interval $(0,1)$. Therefore we can infer the endpoints of each of the intervals in the chain directly from their lengths. Since the support of z^* is X, every element v is contained in such a tight chain C. The result follows. □

Following Lemma 10, we denote $I(P)$ *the* interval order represented by the optimal collection of intervals for P. The collection $\{(y_{v^-}^*, y_{v^+}^*)\}_{v\in X}$ is called the *canonical* interval representation of $I(P)$.

Now assume that the poset $P = (X, \leqslant)$ has width 2. In this case $\overline{G}(P)$ is in particular bipartite with bipartition, say, $A \cup B$. Hence A and B correspond to disjoint chains that cover the poset P. Moreover, transitivity of $\leqslant$ implies immediately that for each u in A (respectively in B), the neighbors of u in B (respectively in A) form a chain in B (in A). We say that $\overline{G}(P)$ is *biconvex*.

Because $\overline{G}(P)$ is bipartite, the canonical interval representation of $I(P)$ can be constructed with the KM algorithm. Denote by $z^* \in \mathrm{STAB}(\overline{G}(P))$ the optimal solution of (2) for $\overline{G}(P)$. Letting $x_v^* := \frac{1}{nz_v^*}$ for $v \in V$, we find the optimal solution of (2) for $G(P)$. Thus the lengths of the intervals are given by:

$$x_u^* = \frac{|A_i| + |B_i|}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|A_i|} \quad \text{if } u \in A_i \quad \text{and} \quad x_v^* = \frac{|A_i| + |B_i|}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|B_i|} \quad \text{if } v \in B_i.$$

Notice that we have $\sum_{u\in A} x_u^* = 1 = \sum_{v\in B} x_v^*$ thus each of the chains A and B yield a chain of consecutive intervals spanning $(0,1)$ in the canonical interval representation of $I(P)$ (unless $A_i = \varnothing$ or $B_i = \varnothing$ for some i, that is, unless if P has some cutpoint —see Figure 3 for an illustration). The endpoints of all the intervals can be directly inferred from this. Moreover, as the following lemma shows, the pairs A_i, B_i are distributed in a very orderly way in the chains A, B. Since the result follows directly from Lemma 8 and [3, Lemma 10], we omit the proof.

Lemma 11. *Let P be a width-2 poset, let A_i, B_i for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ be the pairs given by the KM algorithm and moreover let $C_i := A_i \cup B_i$ for all i. Then there exists a permutation σ of $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $C_{\sigma(1)} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant C_{\sigma(k)}$ in P. In particular, each A_i and each B_i is an interval in its respective chain.*

It follows from Lemma 11 that the canonical representation of $I(P)$ has

- $|A_{\sigma(i)}|$ consecutive intervals all of length $\frac{|C_{\sigma(i)}|}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|A_{\sigma(i)}|}$ as well as
- $|B_{\sigma(i)}|$ consecutive intervals of length $\frac{|C_{\sigma(i)}|}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|B_{\sigma(i)}|}$

within the interval $\left(\sum_{j<i} \frac{|C_{\sigma(j)}|}{n}, \sum_{j\leqslant i} \frac{|C_{\sigma(j)}|}{n}\right)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Similarly to Figure 1, we can represent $I(P)$ as a perfect packing of n rectangles of area $\frac{1}{n}$ in the unit square. This time we rotate the packing by 90 degrees and use the linear order on the C_i's induced by P. We represent each element $v \in X$ by a rectangle of width x_v^* and height z_v^*, in such a way that the projections of the rectangles on the x axis form the canonical interval representation of $I(P)$, see Figure 2.

We now study closely the structure of the graph $\overline{G}(I(P))$. The connected components of $\overline{G}(I(P))$ can actually be inferred directly from the canonical representation of $I(P)$: because the intervals for elements of chain A are consecutive and span the interval $(0,1)$ and similarly for chain B, every two consecutive connected components are separated by a *breakpoint*, that is a value $\beta \in [0,1]$ such that every interval $(y_{v^-}^*, y_{v^+}^*)$ has $\beta \leqslant y_{v^-}^*$ or $y_{v^+}^* \leqslant \beta$, that is, each



FIGURE 2. Perfect rectangle packing for $I(P)$. The green edges are the incomparabilities of $I(P)$. The red edge is an incomparability of P that disappeared in $I(P)$.

interval is entirely to the left of or entirely to the right of β. In particular, $\beta = \sum_{j \leqslant i} \frac{|C_{\sigma(j)}|}{n}$ is a breakpoint for each $i = 0, \ldots, k$. Hence $I(P)$ admits at least two breakpoints, 0 and 1, they will be called the *trivial* breakpoints. Let $0 = \beta_0 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \beta_\ell = 1$ denote the breakpoints of $I(P)$. For $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, we define the *epoch* E_i to be the set of elements of P represented by the intervals located between β_{i-1} and β_i. Note that in general E_i contains elements from both chains A and B. Moreover, since $\sum_{j \leqslant i} \frac{|C_{\sigma(j)}|}{n}$ is a breakpoint for all i, each epoch is contained in C_q for some $q \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

From now on, we will use the notation $\Psi_i := E_i \cap A$ and $\Omega_i := E_i \cap B$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$. For the cardinalities, we use $\psi_i = |\Psi_i|$ and $\omega_i = |\Omega_i|$.

Lemma 12. *The connected components of $\overline{G}(I(P))$ are exactly the subgraphs induced on the epochs E_i. Moreover, each of these subgraphs is bipartite with bipartition $\Psi_i \cup \Omega_i$. Finally, we have* $\gcd(\psi_i, \omega_i) = 1$.

Proof. By definition of a breakpoint, E_i is disconnected from E_j for $i \neq j$. Hence it suffices to show that every epoch E_i induces a connected subgraph of $\overline{G}(I(P))$. If $|E_i| = 1$ then this is obvious. Assume that $|E_i| \geqslant 2$. Then $\psi_i \geqslant 1$ and $\omega_i \geqslant 1$. In the canonical interval representation of $I(P)$, the intervals for the elements of Ψ_i (respectively Ω_i) are consecutive and span (β_{i-1}, β_i). Moreover, there is no breakpoint β in the open interval (β_{i-1}, β_i). From this, we conclude that E_i induces a connected component of $\overline{G}(I(P))$.

The graph $\overline{G}(I(P))$ being itself bipartite with bipartition $A \cup B$, the second assertion is obvious.

For the last assertion, suppose that E_i is contained in $C_j = A_j \cup B_j$. Then we know that the intervals for elements of E_i in the canonical interval representation are:

- ψ_i consecutive intervals of length $\frac{|C_j|}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|A_j|}$ and
- ω_i consecutive intervals of length $\frac{|C_j|}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|B_j|}$

within the interval (β_{i-1}, β_i). If $\gcd(\psi_i, \omega_i) = t > 1$, then observe that the $\frac{\psi_i}{t}$th interval for an element in Ψ_i and the $\frac{\omega_i}{t}$th interval for an element of Ω_i have the same right endpoint, which implies the existence of a breakpoint $\beta \in (\beta_{i-1}, \beta_i)$, a contradiction. □

4. Phantom edges

We use the same notations as in the previous section. Our proof of Theorem 3 is by induction on $n := |P|$. Since the case $n \leqslant 2$ is clear, we assume $n \geqslant 3$. Furthermore, if $\overline{G}(P)$ is not connected, then P is an ordinal sum $P_1' \oplus P_2'$ of two smaller posets and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) &= |P_1'| \cdot H(\overline{P_1'}) + |P_2'| \cdot H(\overline{P_2'}) \qquad \text{(by Lemma 4)}, \\ \log e(P) &= \log e(P_1') + \log e(P_2') \quad \text{and} \\ \kappa_2(P) &= \kappa_2(P_1') + \kappa_2(P_2'). \end{aligned}$$

By induction, (1) is satisfied by P_1' and P_2', and thus for P. Hence, we may assume that $\overline{G}(P)$ is connected. Note that in this case, $\kappa_2(P) = 0$.

It would be convenient to work with $I(P)$ rather than P, because $\overline{G}(I(P))$ has more structure than $\overline{G}(P)$: for instance, it is an interval graph. But this is not possible, because $\overline{G}(I(P))$ may be disconnected even if $\overline{G}(P)$ is connected. (For example, consider P with ground set $X = \{a, a', b, b'\}$ and comparabilities $a \leqslant a'$, $b \leqslant b'$ and $a \leqslant b'$.) The goal of this section is to restore the connectivity by adding artificial edges to $\overline{G}(I(P))$ between consecutive epochs —the 'phantom edges'— so that the incomparability graph of the resulting width-2 interval order Q is connected. These edges are chosen among the edges of $\overline{G}(P)$ that disappeared in $\overline{G}(I(P))$, which explains the name 'phantom edge'. This implies that $H(P) = H(Q)$, which will later allow us to with Q rather than with P.

Since we assume $\overline{G}(I(P))$ connected, there is always at least one edge uv between epochs E_i and E_{i+1}. Indeed, because $\overline{G}(P)$ is biconvex, we may assume that u is the last element of Ψ_i and v the first element of Ω_{i+1}, or u is the last element of Ω_i and v is the first element of Ψ_{i+1}. Notice that in general (that is, unless we both have $\psi_i = \omega_i$ and $\psi_{i+1} = \omega_{i+1}$, which implies $\psi_i = \omega_i = \psi_{i+1} = \omega_{i+1} = 1$ because $\gcd(\psi_i, \omega_i) = \gcd(\psi_{i+1}, \omega_{i+1}) = 1$, see Lemma 12), these cases are mutually exclusive since $z^* \in \mathrm{STAB}(\overline{G}(P))$ implies $z^*_u + z^*_v \leqslant 1$. To obtain Q from $I(P)$, we add one such edge uv to the incomparability graph of $I(P)$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell - 1\}$. We call these extra edges *phantom edges*.

Lemma 13. *The poset Q satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) $\overline{G}(Q)$ is connected;
(ii) Q is a width-2 interval order;
(iii) $H(Q) = H(P)$;
(iv) $e(Q) \leqslant e(P)$.

Proof. (i) This follows from Lemma 12 and the construction of Q.

(ii) The fact that the width of Q is 2 follows from the assumption that the width of P is 2 and from the fact that Q is an extension of P.

Now we explain how to modify the canonical representation of $I(P)$ in order to obtain an interval representation of Q. As before, let ℓ denote the number of epochs E_i. Thus $q = \ell - 1$ gives the number of breakpoints in $(0, 1)$. For each breakpoint $\beta \in (0, 1)$ we introduce a gap of $1/q$ between the intervals on each side of β, so that all intervals in the representation now fit in the interval $(0, 2)$, and cover half of its area.

Consider some breakpoint β that has a corresponding phantom edge uv with the interval for u touching the left of the newly created gap and the interval for v touching the right of that gap. Then by adding $1/q$ to the right endpoint of the interval for u and subtracting $1/q$ to the left endpoint of the interval for v, we make sure that these intervals intersect. After having treated in such a way all breakpoints that have a phantom edge, we obtain an interval representation for the poset Q. This is illustrated in Figure 3.

(iii) The poset $I(P)$ is an extension of Q which is in turn an extension of P. Hence $H(P) \leqslant H(Q) \leqslant H(I(P))$. But we know $H(I(P)) = H(P)$, so we have equality throughout.

(iv) Obviously, $e(Q) \leqslant e(P)$ since Q extends P. □



FIGURE 3. The interval representation of $I(P)$ and Q for P the disjoint union of a chain of length 4 and a chain of lentgh 2. The colors used in the figure give a 2-coloring of the corresponding incomparability graph.

Now assume that (1) holds for Q. Then, by Lemma 13, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) &= |Q| \cdot H(\overline{Q}) \quad \text{(because } H(P) = H(Q)\text{)} \\
&\leqslant (2-\varepsilon) \log e(Q) \quad \text{(because (1) holds for } Q \text{ and } \kappa_2(Q) = 0\text{)} \\
&\leqslant (2-\varepsilon) \log e(P) \quad \text{(because } e(Q) \leqslant e(P)\text{)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to prove Theorem 1, we can assume that $P = Q$, that is, P is a width-2 interval order that coincides with $I(P)$ except perhaps for a few incomparabilities.

5. Removing an incomparability with a small overlap

As discussed in the previous section, in order to prove Theorem 3, we may assume the following facts on the width-2 poset P:

- it has $n \geqslant 3$ elements,
- its incomparability graph is connected (hence $\kappa_2(P) = 0$),
- finally, P coincides with $I(P)$ except for a few pairs of elements: the phantom edges.

In particular, $\overline{G}(P)$ has no isolated vertex and thus we have $\psi_i \geqslant 1$ and $\omega_i \geqslant 1$ for all i.

Our strategy is to seek two elements u, v that are incomparable in P and whose intervals in the canonical interval representation of $I(P)$ have 'small' overlap. For instance, uv could be a phantom edge: in this case the overlap is zero. We will prove that the removal of uv from $\overline{G}(P)$ yields a new poset P' satisfying the following three conditions:

(C1) $nH(\overline{P}) = nH(\overline{P'}) + \Delta h$ and $\log e(P) = \log e(P') + \Delta e$ with $\Delta h \leqslant (2-\varepsilon)\Delta e$;
(C2) the poset P' decomposes as an ordinal sum $P'_1 \oplus P'_2$;
(C3) $\kappa_2(P'_1) = \kappa_2(P'_2) = 0$.

Assuming that such an edge uv can be found, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) &= |P'| \cdot H(\overline{P'}) + \Delta h \quad \text{(by definition of } \Delta h\text{)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1,2} |P'_i| \cdot H(\overline{P'_i}) + \Delta h \quad \text{(since } P' = P'_1 \oplus P'_2\text{)} \\
&\leqslant \sum_{i=1,2} \left((2-\varepsilon) \log e(P'_i) + \varepsilon \underbrace{\kappa_2(P'_i)}_{=0} \right) + \Delta h \quad \text{(by induction)} \\
&\leqslant \sum_{i=1,2} (2-\varepsilon) \log e(P'_i) + (2-\varepsilon)\Delta e \quad \text{(since } \Delta h \leqslant (2-\varepsilon)\Delta e\text{)} \\
&\leqslant (2-\varepsilon)(\log e(P') + \Delta e) \quad \text{(since } P' = P'_1 \oplus P'_2\text{)} \\
&= (2-\varepsilon) \log e(P) + \varepsilon \overbrace{\kappa_2(P)}^{=0} \quad \text{(by definition of } \Delta e\text{)}.
\end{aligned}$$

5.1. **Removing a phantom edge.** It turns out that, except in a few particular cases, if $\overline{G}(P)$ admits phantom edges, then the conditions here above are easily satisfied. Indeed, if the edge uv is a phantom edge, we have $\Delta h = 0$. In particular, (C1) holds. Moreover, (C2) also holds because the removal of the incomparability uv disconnects $\overline{G}(P)$ in exactly two connected components. Thus the only condition that remains to check is (C3). This condition always holds unless uv links the first pair of epochs E_1, E_2 and $|E_1| = 2$ or uv links the last pair of epochs $E_{\ell-1}, E_\ell$ and $|E_\ell| = 2$. Hence a good choice of uv is possible whenever $\ell \geqslant 4$. In case $2 \leqslant \ell \leqslant 3$, there exists a good phantom edge unless $(|E_1|, \ldots, |E_\ell|)$ is equal to $(2, m)$ or $(m, 2)$ or $(2, m, 2)$ for some integer $m \geqslant 2$. In the case $\ell = 1$ and in these cases, taking uv to be a phantom edge will not work and we have to choose uv differently.

5.2. **Removing an edge within an epoch.** Fix an index $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$. Now, we inspect more closely the structure of the subposet of P induced on $E_i = \Psi_i \cup \Omega_i$. We denote this subposet by P_i. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\psi_i \geqslant \omega_i \geqslant 1$. By our assumption on P, the subposet P_i agrees with the subposet of $I(P)$ induced on E_i, and is thus an interval order that admits an interval representation in $(0, 1)$ obtained as follows:

- starting from 0, put side by side ψ_i intervals of length $\frac{1}{\psi_i}$;
- starting again from 0, put side by side ω_i intervals of length $\frac{1}{\omega_i}$.

Recall that in the canonical interval representation of $I(P)$, the corresponding intervals have length $\frac{|C_j|}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|A_j|} \propto \frac{1}{|\Psi_i|}$ and $\frac{|C_j|}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|B_j|} \propto \frac{1}{|\Omega_i|}$ respectively, where $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ is such that $E_i \subseteq C_j$ and the proportionality constants are identical. In the above representation, we delete all intervals for elements not in P_i and then rescale (and translate) so that the intervals again span $(0, 1)$.

By Lemma 12, we know that $\gcd(\psi_i, \omega_i) = 1$.

Lemma 14. *If $\psi_i \geqslant 2$ and $\omega_i \geqslant 2$, there exist two elements $u, v \in P_i$ such that the corresponding intervals overlap in an interval of length exactly $\frac{1}{\psi_i \omega_i}$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that there are two integers m and p with $0 < m < \psi_i$, $0 < p < \omega_i$ and $\left|\frac{m}{\psi_i} - \frac{p}{\omega_i}\right| = \frac{1}{\psi_i \omega_i}$, that is, $|m\omega_i - p\psi_i| = 1$. Since $\gcd(\psi_i, \omega_i) = 1$ there exist integers m, p with $|m\omega_i - p\psi_i| = 1$. It remains to prove that we can assume $0 < m < \psi_i$ and $0 < p < \omega_i$. Note that $|m\omega_i - p\psi_i| = 1$ implies $|(m - t\psi_i)\omega_i - (p - t\omega_i)\psi_i| = 1$ for every $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence one may suppose $0 < m \leqslant \psi_i$ and this implies $0 < p \leqslant \omega_i$. But $m = \psi_i$ implies $\psi_i = 1$, and $p = \omega_i$ implies $\omega_i = 1$. This concludes the proof. □

In fact we can always suppose that there exist m and p with

$$\frac{m}{\psi_i} - \frac{p}{\omega_i} = \frac{1}{\psi_i \omega_i}. \tag{5}$$

Indeed, if $\frac{m}{\psi_i} - \frac{p}{\omega_i} = -\frac{1}{\psi_i \omega_i}$ we just remplace m by $\psi_i - m$ and p by $\omega_i - p$. Hence we know that the corresponding intervals are the m-th of length $1/\psi_i$ and the $(p+1)$-th of length $1/\omega_i$. In this case, an interval of length $1/\psi_i$ immediately to the right of the interval for u must exist, as well as an interval of length $1/\omega_i$ immediately to the left of the interval for v, see Figure 4. In the figure and henceforth, we denote $I(u)$ the interval for u, and similarly for the other elements.

Lemma 15. *Let P_i be the subposet of P induced by some epoch E_i with $\psi_i \geqslant \omega_i \geqslant 2$ and u, v be two elements of P_i whose intervals in the interval representation of P_i are such that $I(u) \cap I(v)$ is of length $1/\psi_i\omega_i$. Then the suppression of uv from $\overline{G}(P)$ yields a poset P' with*

$$\Delta h := nH(\overline{P}) - nH(\overline{P'}) \leqslant 2 \log \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{(\psi_i + \omega_i)^2}} \right)$$

and P' is an ordinal sum of two smaller posets P'_1 and P'_2. Moreover, unless $\psi_i = \omega_i + 1$, both P'_1 and P'_2 have at least three elements that are also in P_i.



FIGURE 4. The intervals $I(u)$ and $I(v)$ of Lemma 14 and the neighboring intervals.

Proof. Let $n := |P| := |X|$ with X the ground set of poset P. As noticed above, we can assume $I(u)$ and $I(v)$ are such that the left endpoint of $I(u)$ is to the left of $I(v)$, as in Figure 4. We define the elements u' and v' as precedingly. By this local modification we get a new poset P' with $\overline{G}(P') = \overline{G}(P) - uv$.

The idea is to move the right endpoint of $I(u)$, which is also the left endpoint of $I(u')$, by $\frac{1}{\psi_i(\psi_i+\omega_i)} = \frac{\omega_i}{(\psi_i\omega_i)(\psi_i+\omega_i)}$ to the left and the left endpoint of $I(v)$, which is also the right endpoint of $I(v')$, by $\frac{1}{\omega_i(\psi_i+\omega_i)}$ to the right, see Figure 5.



FIGURE 5. After the modification of the intervals $I(u)$, $I(v)$, $I(u')$ and $I(v')$.

We denote as before x_w the length of the interval $I(w)$ for $w \in X$ in $I(P)$, and x'_w the length of that interval after modification. Since $I(u)$ and $I(u')$ have length $1/\psi_i$ and $I(v)$, $I(v')$ have length $1/\omega_i$ we have:

$$x'_u = \frac{1}{\psi_i}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\psi_i + \omega_i}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad x'_{u'} = \frac{1}{\psi_i}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\psi_i + \omega_i}\right)$$

and also, for the elements in the other chain,

$$x'_v = \frac{1}{\omega_i}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\psi_i + \omega_i}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad x'_{v'} = \frac{1}{\omega_i}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\psi_i + \omega_i}\right).$$

By (4), this shows

$$\begin{aligned} n \cdot H(P') \leqslant -\sum_{w\in X} \log x'_w &= -\sum_{w\in X} \log x_w + 2\log\left(\frac{1}{\psi_i}\right) + 2\log\left(\frac{1}{\omega_i}\right) \\ &\quad - \log\frac{1}{\psi_i}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\psi_i+\omega_i}\right) - \log\frac{1}{\omega_i}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\psi_i+\omega_i}\right) \\ &\quad - \log\frac{1}{\psi_i}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\psi_i+\omega_i}\right) - \log\frac{1}{\omega_i}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\psi_i+\omega_i}\right) \\ &= -\sum_{w\in X} \log x_w + \underbrace{2\log\left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{(\psi_i+\omega_i)^2}}\right)}_{=:f(\psi_i,\omega_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

So $n \cdot H(P') \leqslant n \cdot H(P) + f(\psi_i, \omega_i)$, which by theorem 6 implies $\Delta h \leqslant f(\psi_i, \omega_i)$.

Now by the structure of the intervals in $I(P)$ (Lemma 11) it is clear that $P' = P'_1 \oplus P'_2$ for two smaller posets P'_1 and P'_2: the elements of P'_1 are those whose new interval is to the left of the breakpoint β created by the local modification (see Figure 5), and similarly the elements of P'_1 are those whose new interval is to the right of β. It is clear that both P'_1 and P'_2 each contain at least two elements of P_i, namely, u and v' for P'_1 and v and u' for P'_2.

If P'_1 has less than 3 elements of P_i, then $I(u)$ is the first interval of length $1/\psi_i$ and $I(v)$ the second interval of length $1/\omega_i$. This implies $\ell = 1$ and $m+1 = 2$ in (5) that is $\omega_i = \psi_i + 1$, and this is a contradiction since we supposed $\psi_i \geqslant \omega_i$. Similarly if P'_2 has less than 3 elements of P_i then $\ell = \psi_i - 1$ and $m + 1 = \omega_i$ and this implies $\psi_i = \omega_i + 1$. □

Now, we analyze how the number of linear extensions of P changes after the deletion of the incomparability uv.

Lemma 16. *Let P_i be the subposet of P induced by some E_i and u, v be two elements of P_i whose intervals in the interval representation of P_i are such that $I(u) \cap I(v)$ is of length $1/\psi_i\omega_i$. Let $P' = P'_1 \oplus P'_2$ be the poset obtained by deleting the edge uv from $\overline{G}(P)$. Then*

$$\Delta e := \log e(P) - \log e(P') \geqslant \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{2\frac{\psi_i}{\omega_i} + 4}\right).$$

Proof. The inequality we have to prove can be rewritten

$$e(P) \geqslant e(P'_1 \oplus P'_2) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{2\frac{\psi_i}{\omega_i} + 4}\right).$$

Since the linear extensions of $P'_1 \oplus P'_2$ correspond to the linear extensions of P with $u \prec v$, we have to establish that a big enough fraction of the linear extensions $\prec$ of P have $v \prec u$.

We call a linear extension $\prec$ of P *backward* if $v \prec u$, and a *forward* if $u \prec v$. The forward extensions correspond to those of $P' = P'_1 \oplus P'_2$. Clearly, for a backward extension of P we have in particular:

> (*) $v \prec w$ for every element $w \neq u$ incomparable to v, and $z \prec u$ for every element $z \neq v$ incomparable to u.



FIGURE 6. The local structure of the graph $\overline{G}(P_i)$.

We call a forward extension *good* if it satisfies property (*). Note that any good forward extension gives one backward extension, simply by interchanging u and v (which are consecutive in any good forward extension).

Every linear extension $\prec$ of P induces an orientation of the incomparability graph $\overline{G}(P)$: we orient each edge wz from w to z if $w \prec z$ in the extension. We define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on the set $\mathcal{E}(P)$ of linear extensions of P by letting $\prec_1 \sim \prec_2$ if and only if $\prec_1$ and $\prec_2$ induce the same orientation of the edges $\overline{G}(P)$ incident to neither u nor v.

Each class of this equivalence relation $\sim$ contains precisely one good forward extension, and this good forward extension gives one backward extension. Thus the number of good forward

extensions is exactly the number of classes of $\sim$, and this number is at least

$$\frac{e(P_1' \oplus P_2')}{M}$$

where M is the maximum number of extensions in one class. Hence we have

$$e(P) \geqslant e(P_1' \oplus P_2') \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{M}\right)$$

and it remains to prove

$$M \leqslant 2\frac{\psi_i}{\omega_i} + 4. \tag{6}$$

To do so we upper bound, for any given forward extension $\prec$, the number of possible orientations for the edges of $\overline{G}(P)$ that are incident to u or v.

Let $u < u' < \ldots < u^{(s)}$ denote the neighbors of v in $\overline{G}(P)$ and $v' < v$ denote the neighbors of u in this graph, see Figure 6. Looking at the interval representation of P_i, we see that the intervals $I(u'), \ldots, I(u^{(s-1)})$ are all included in $I(v)$ and cover an area that is at most the area of $I(v)$. In other words, we have

$$\frac{s-1}{\psi_i} \leqslant \frac{1}{\omega_i} \iff s \leqslant \frac{\psi_i}{\omega_i} + 1.$$

We have exaclty $s+1$ different possibilities for inserting v in the opposite chain, and hence a forward extension can orient the edges of $\overline{G}(P)$ incident to u in exactly $s+1$ ways (recall that $u \prec v$ because the extension is forward). Because the edge uv', which is the last edge we have to consider, can be oriented in at most two ways, we get $M \leqslant 2(s+2) \leqslant 2(\frac{\psi_i}{\omega_i} + 2)$ and (6) follows. □

And finally:

Lemma 17. *For all $x \geqslant y \geqslant 2$, we have*

$$2\log\left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{(x+y)^2}}\right) \leqslant \frac{3}{2}\log\left(1 + \frac{1}{2\frac{x}{y} + 4}\right).$$

Proof. First, note that

$$2\log\left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{(x+y)^2}}\right) = 2\log\left(\frac{\frac{x}{y} + \frac{y}{x} + 2}{\frac{x}{y} + \frac{y}{x} + 2 - \frac{1}{xy}}\right)$$

and since $x, y \geqslant 2$, we have $2 - \frac{1}{xy} \geqslant \frac{7}{4}$. Hence letting $u := \frac{x}{y}$ we have

$$2\log\left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{(x+y)^2}}\right) \leqslant 2\log\left(\frac{u + \frac{1}{u} + 2}{u + \frac{1}{u} + \frac{7}{4}}\right) \leqslant \log\left(\frac{u+2}{u + \frac{7}{4}}\right)$$

and

$$\log\left(1 + \frac{1}{2\frac{x}{y} + 4}\right) = \log\left(\frac{u + 5/2}{u + 2}\right).$$

The target inequality is thus implied by

$$(u+2)^7 \leqslant (u + 7/4)^4 (u + 5/2)^3$$

which can be rewritten (after performing a straighforward computation) as

$$0 \leqslant \frac{1}{2}u^6 + \frac{45}{8}u^5 + \frac{209}{8}u^4 + \frac{16401}{256}u^3 + \frac{44751}{512}u^2 + \frac{64323}{1024}u + \frac{37981}{2048}.$$

The result follows. □

6. Proof of main theorem

Proof of Theorem 3. Let now P be any width-2 poset. The proof is by induction on n. Clearly, we may assume $n \geqslant 3$ since the theorem holds for $n \leqslant 2$. We have established in Section 4 that we may without loss of generality assume P is an interval order that coincides with $I(P)$ except perhaps for a few incomparabilities: the phantom edges.

Let $E_1 = \Psi_1 \cup \Omega_1, \ldots, E_l = \Psi_\ell \cup \Omega_\ell$ be the epochs of P. In Section 5 we proved that we may assume the following:

- for each i we have $\gcd(\psi_i, \omega_i) = 1$ where $\psi_i := |\Psi_i|$ and $\omega_i := |\Omega_i|$;
- either $\ell = 1$, or $\ell = 2$ and $(|E_1|, |E_2|)$ is equal to $(2, m)$ or $(m, 2)$ for an integer $m \geq 2$, or $\ell = 3$ and $(|E_1|, |E_2|, |E_3|)$ is equal $(2, m, 2)$ for an integer $m \geq 2$.

Let $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ be such that $|\Psi_i|$ is maximum and assume without loss of generality that $\psi_i \geqslant \omega_i$. Then, combining Lemmas 14, 15, 16 and 17, we are able to find a good edge to remove to $\overline{G}(P)$ in case $\psi_i, \omega_i \geqslant 2$ and $\psi_i > \omega_i + 1$. Hence the only cases left to consider are the following ones:

(1) $\ell = 1$, $\psi_1 = \omega_1 + 1$;
(2) $\ell = 1$, $\omega_1 = 1$ and $\psi_1 \geqslant 3$;
(3) $\ell = 2$, $\omega_i = 1$ and $\psi_i \geqslant 2$;
(4) $\ell = 3$, $\omega_i = 1$ and $\psi_i \geqslant 2$;
(5) $\ell = 2$, $\psi_i = \omega_i + 1$.
(6) $\ell = 3$, $\psi_i = \omega_i + 1$.

Note that for the second case, we assume $\psi_1 \geqslant 3$ because the first one encompass the possibility $\psi_1 = 2$ and $\omega_1 = 1$. Each of these cases follows from the results of Section 7 below. In particular, we prove that $\ell = 1$ and $\psi_1 = \omega_1 + 1$ implies that $\overline{G}(P_1)$ is a path and that the theorem holds in this case. This concludes the proof. □

7. Special cases

In this section we consider the particular cases that we need to complete the proof of our main result, starting with the first case of the list here above.

Lemma 18. *Let P be the width-2 interval order obtained by putting side by side x intervals of length $1/x$ starting at 0 and then y intervals of length $1/y$ starting at 0, where $x \geqslant y \geqslant 2$. If $x = y + 1$ then $\overline{G}(P)$ is a path with an odd number of vertices.*

Proof. Note first that the number of vertices of $\overline{G}(P)$ is equal to $x + y = 2y + 1$ and hence it is odd.

Since $\gcd(x, y) = 1$, we know that $\overline{G}(P)$ is connected. Moreover, the graph has at least one degree-1 vertex, namely the vertex whose interval starts at 0 and is of length $1/x$. Thus, it suffices to show that the degree of each vertex is at most 2. But this is clear because if a vertex of $\overline{G}(P)$ has degree $d \geqslant 3$, then the corresponding interval contains the intervals of at least $d-2$ of its neighbors. In particular, the interval is necessarily of length $1/b$ and we have $d \leqslant 3$. Furthermore, the endpoints of all intervals are located at integer multiples of $1/xy$. Thus if an interval of length $1/y = x \cdot (1/xy)$ contains one interval of length $1/x = y \cdot (1/xy) = (x-1) \cdot (1/xy)$ then it intersects exactly one other interval (and moreover both intervals either start at 0 or end at 1). This implies that $d \leqslant 2$. The result follows. □

Lemma 19. *Let P be poset whose incomparability graph is a path with $n \geqslant 3$ vertices, with n odd. Then*

$$|P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) \leqslant (2 - \varepsilon) \log e(P)$$

Proof. It is known that, if $\overline{G}(P)$ is a n-vertex path, then $e(P) = F_{n+1}$ with $n = |P|$ and F_{n+1} the $(n+1)$-th Fibonacci number, see for example Atkinson and Chang [1]. To compute $H(\overline{P})$ we use the KM algorithm, see Theorem 7. Assume without loss of generality that the bipartition A, B of $\overline{G}(P)$ satisfies $|A| \geqslant |B|$.

Because $n = 2q + 1$ is odd, we find $k = 1$ and $|A_1| = |A| = q + 1$, $|B_1| = |B| = q$ (we leave it to the reader the task of verifying this). Hence we have

$$|P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) = (2q+1) \cdot h\left(\frac{q}{2q+1}\right) = (q+1)\log\left(\frac{2q+1}{q+1}\right) + q\log\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right).$$

By a direct computation, we see that the inequality holds for $q \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Notice in passing that the inequality is tight for $q = 1$. For $q = 2$ the ratio is equal to

$$\frac{3\log(5/3) + 2\log(5/2)}{\log(8)} \simeq 1.62$$

From now on, we assume $q \geqslant 3$. From the easy lower bound $F_n \geqslant \phi^{n-2}$, where $n \geqslant 3$ and $\phi := \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ is the golden ratio, we obtain

$$\frac{|P| \cdot H(\overline{G}(P))}{\log(e(P))} \leqslant \frac{(q+1)\log\left(\frac{2q+1}{q+1}\right) + q\log\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right)}{\log(\phi^{2q})} = \underbrace{\frac{\frac{q+1}{q}\log\left(\frac{2q+1}{q+1}\right) + \log\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right)}{2\log(\phi)}}_{=:f(q)}.$$

Since $f'(x) < 0$ for every $x > 0$ we get $f(q) \leqslant f(3) \simeq 1.65 \leqslant 2 - \varepsilon$ for every $q \geqslant 3$. □

This concludes the proof of case (1) in the proof of Theorem 3. The following lemma settles case (2).



FIGURE 7. $\overline{G}(P)$ in the particular case (2) $\ell = 1$, $\omega_1 = 1$, $\psi_1 \geqslant 3$.

Lemma 20. *Let P be poset whose incomparability graph is a star with $n \geqslant 3$ vertices. Then*

$$|P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) \leqslant (2 - \varepsilon)\log e(P)$$

Proof. Let $\psi_1 = n - 1$ denote the number of leaves of the star and $\omega_1 := 1$ (see Figure 7). We have $\log e(P) = \log(\psi_1 + 1)$ and

$$|P| \cdot H(\overline{P}) = \psi_1 \log\left(\frac{\psi_1 + 1}{\psi_1}\right) + \log(\psi_1 + 1).$$

Now we are done since for $u \geqslant 2$:

$$f(u) := \frac{u\log\left(\frac{u+1}{u}\right) + \log(u+1)}{\log(u+1)} \leqslant 2 - \varepsilon$$

Indeed, $f(2) = 2 - \varepsilon$ and for $u > 2$, the function $(1 + \frac{1}{u})^u$ is increasing and tends to the number e for $u \to \infty$. Hence for $u \geqslant 3$ we have $(1 + \frac{1}{u})^u \leqslant e$ and so

$$f(u) = 1 + \frac{u\log\left(\frac{u+1}{u}\right)}{\log(u+1)} \leqslant 1 + \frac{\log(e)}{\log(4)} \leqslant 1.73 \leqslant 2 - \varepsilon.$$

□

Cases (3)–(6) in the proof of Theorem 3 can be treated similarly as in Lemmas 19 and 20. We only summarize the main differences in Table 1 below. It is a straightforward task to turn the information in the table into a complete proof. We leave this to the reader.

Case 3: $\ell = 2$, $\omega_i = 1$ and $\psi_i \geqslant 2$	
$\log e(P) = \log(2\psi_i + 3)$	$\lvert P\rvert \cdot H(\overline{P}) = 2 + \psi_i \log\left(\frac{\psi_i + 1}{\psi_i}\right) + \log(\psi_i + 1)$
$\frac{\lvert P\rvert \cdot H(\overline{P})}{\log e(P)} \leqslant \frac{3\log(3)}{\log(7)} \leqslant 1.7$	$\overline{G}(P)$ 
Case 4: $\ell = 3$, $\omega_i = 1$ and $\psi_i \geqslant 2$	
$\log e(P) = \log(4\psi_i + 8)$	$\lvert P\rvert \cdot H(\overline{P}) = 4 + \psi_i \log\left(\frac{\psi_i + 1}{\psi_i}\right) + \log(\psi_i + 1)$
$\frac{\lvert P\rvert \cdot H(\overline{P})}{\log e(P)} \leqslant \frac{2 + 3\log(3)}{4} \leqslant 1.7$	$\overline{G}(P)$ 
Case 5: $\ell = 2$, $\omega_i = \psi_i + 1$	
$\log e(P) = \log(F_{2\omega_i+4})$	$\lvert P\rvert \cdot H(\overline{P}) = 2 + (\omega_i + 1)\log\left(\frac{2\omega_i + 1}{\omega_i + 1}\right) + \omega_i \log\left(\frac{2\omega_i + 1}{\omega_i}\right)$
$\frac{\lvert P\rvert \cdot H(\overline{P})}{\log e(P)} \leqslant \frac{3\log(3)}{4\log(\phi)} \leqslant 1.72$	$\overline{G}(P)$ 
Case 6: $\ell = 3$, $\omega_i = \psi_i + 1$	
$\log e(P) = \log(F_{2\omega_i+6})$	$\lvert P\rvert \cdot H(\overline{P}) = 4 + (\omega_i + 1)\log\left(\frac{2\omega_i + 1}{\omega_i + 1}\right) + \omega_i \log\left(\frac{2\omega_i + 1}{\omega_i}\right)$
$\frac{\lvert P\rvert \cdot H(\overline{P})}{\log e(P)} \leqslant \frac{2 + 3\log(3)}{6\log(\phi)} \leqslant 1.7$	$\overline{G}(P)$ 

TABLE 1. For each one of cases (3)–(6) in the proof of Theorem 3, the table gives the expressions of both $\log e(P)$ and $\lvert P\rvert \cdot H(\overline{P})$, an upper bound on the ratio and a drawing of the incomparability graph $\overline{G}(P)$.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Atkinson, H.W. Chang, *Computing the number of merging with constraints*, Information Processing Letters 24 (1987), 289-292.

[2] J. Cardinal, S. Fiorini, G. Joret, R. Jungers, J. Ian Munro, *Sorting under Partial Information (without the Ellipsoid Algorithm)*, STOC'10 Proceedings of the 2010 ACM International Symposium on Theory of Computing, 359368, ACM, New York, 2010.

[3] J. Cardinal, S. Fiorini, G. Joret, R. Jungers, J. Ian Munro, *Sorting under Partial Information (without the Ellipsoid Algorithm)*, Combinatorica.

[4] J. Cardinal, S. Fiorini, G. Joret, R. Jungers, J. Ian Munro, *An efficient algorithm for partial order production*. SIAM J. Comput. 39 (2010), no. 7.

[5] V. Chvátal, *On certain polytopes associated with graphs*. J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B; 18: 138-154, 1975.

[6] R. Diestel, *Graph Theory*, 3 ed. Springer, Berlin, 2005.

[7] J. Kahn, J.H. Kim, *Entropy and sorting*, J. Comput. Sci. 51, 3, 390-399, 1995.

[8] J. Körner, *Coding of an information source having ambiguous alphabet and the entropy of graphs*, Transactions, 6th Prague Conference on Information Theory, etc., 1971, Academia, Prague (1973), 411425.

[9] J. Körner, K. Marton, Graphs that split entropies, SIAM J. Discrete Math., 1 (1988), 71-19.

[10] G.Simonyi, *Graph entropy: A survey*. DIMACS series in discrete mathematics and theoretical computer science, pages 1-38, 1995.

[11] W.T. Trotter, *Combinatorics and Partially Ordered Sets : Dimension Theory*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1992.